

PM&Q Task Force Virtual Meeting

September 24, 2020

1 PM - 2:00 PM EDT

1. Roll Call

AASHTO Region	NAME	Member or Friend?		AASHTO Region	NAME	Member or Friend?	
1				4	Joe Horton, California DOT	Chair	X
	Emily Parkany, Vermont AOT	Member	X		Dave Huft, South Dakota DOT	Member	X
	Ann Scholz, New Hampshire DOT	Friend			Teresa Stephens, Oklahoma DOT	Member	X
	Deirdre Nash	Member	X		Kevin Pete, Texas DOT	Member	X
					Enid White, Wyoming DOT	Member	
2	Joe Crabtree, Kentucky Transportation Center	Co-Chair	X		Ken Chambers, Nevada DOT	Friend	
	Darryl Dockstader, Florida DOT	Member	X		Sue Sillick, Montana DOT	Friend	X
	Meredith Heaps, South Carolina DOT	Member			Dianne Kresich, Arizona DOT	Friend	
	Sam Cooper, Louisiana DOT	Friend			Gary Hook, Oklahoma DOT	Friend	X
	Rhea Vincent, Mississippi DOT	Friend			Matt Miller, Texas A&M	Secretary	X
3	Hafiz Munir, Minnesota DOT	Member		Other Friends	Barbara Harder, B.T. Harder, Inc.	Friend	
	Tommy Nantung, Indiana DOT	Member	X		Jason Bittner, ARA	Friend	X
	Jen Harper, Missouri DOT	Member	X		Chris Hedges, NCHRP	Friend	
	Diane Gurtner, Wisconsin DOT	Friend			David Kuehn, FHWA	Friend	
	David Behzadpour, Kansas DOT	Friend			Chris Kline, CTC & Associates	Friend	
					Brian Hirt, CTC & Associates	Friend	X
					Sid Mohan, TRB	Friend	
			John Moulden, FHWA		Friend		
			Jack Jernigan, FHWA		Friend		

2. Help with Minutes

- Matt will be taking the minutes. Need two volunteers to agree to review Matt's minutes.
- Sue Sillick and Emily Parkany agreed to review the notes.

3. General Updates

- Joe Horton advised that the AASHTO Innovation Community of Practice held meetings recently. This community serves to share successful practices in innovation among groups at DOTs responsible for innovation as a formal activity. If anyone has examples, please send them to Joe so he can post information to the Innovation Community of Practice email list serve.

4. Subgroup Activities

- Research Implementation
 - Joe Crabtree advised they last met on August 12th, and the next meeting is **October 14th, Wednesday at 3pm ET.**
 - Hafiz and Joe are Co-chairs and Stacy Wyman from WashDOT is Secretary.
 - The subgroup has been guiding the NCHRP 20-44 (21) project on Synthesis of Research Peer Exchange Reports and RPPM to distill out implementation best practices. This project is wrapping up with CTC and Associates and the task reports are posted here: <https://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=4831>

- During the RAC summer meeting, the NCHRP 20-44 (21) project was presented by Brian Hirt. Possible webinar versions and a TRB Annual Meeting session on the topic of implementation is pending.
 - Research and implementation subgroup is developing a website for the subgroup.
- b. Program Management Tools
- Tommy Nantung advised that the updates to the High Value Research website and Transportation Pooled Fund Study website are in progress.
 - The high value research website is being migrated first. The RPPM website will be migrated next, followed by the TPF website. There are migration oversight groups for each website. Sue Sillick is championing these RPPM website migration, which should be migrated by February 2021.
 - The TPF migration oversight group is collecting suggestions.
- c. Quality and Timeliness of Research Deliverables
- Jen advised that a RAC survey is available for members to take (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LTLD3SK>)
 - Emily advised two new questions about research performance measures are included in the survey.
 - Jen advised that a follow-up email will be sent indicating new questions have been added and to remind participants to update any changes in their contact.
 - Sue requested that Jen re-sends the spreadsheet that was attached to the first survey request to RAC.
- d. Research Performance Measures
- Emily advised that the performance measures working group is meeting in the next several weeks [meeting now scheduled at 11am ET on October 13].
 - . Templates reflecting information from 19 different reports have been collected by the working group.
 - Next steps to be discussed in the upcoming meeting is how to extract information from the templates to share best practices. It would be ideal to have some guidance by January 2021.
- e. Monitoring Activities
- Whether the PM&Q should keep monitoring Intellectual Property generated a lot of discussion. There is some confusion about whether a “typical” research manager needs to pay attention to IP and some examples were provided. For example, Joe Horton shared a Caltrans example where Caltrans encountered a situation where a company took the data from a Caltrans-funded research project on self-leveling slabs for quick-crete replacement, and patented designs to the point where if Caltrans uses the design they will have to pay the company. Caltrans now defends itself by publishing research and data findings covered by a patent that allows exclusive IP and data management rights. Caltrans also relies on an internal IP working group for advice.
 - Joe Horton asked whether the PMQ group want to develop the issue on intellectual property as a working subgroup, or just relegate it to a discussion in the minutes?
 - Jason Bittner advised that IP and potential risks are covered in the NCHRP Report 799 IP management guide (<http://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/172260.aspx>) and implemented through subsequent workshops (<https://nextcloud.ara.com/nextcloud/index.php/s/bmjcb7QEbzL6c9m#pdfviewer>).
 - Jason Bittner advised that a critical element in this IP topic is research management programs developing formal relationships with PIs to establish understanding on concerns over publication rights, partnership concerns, etc.

- Dave Huft advised the attorneys in South Dakota DOT aren't patent attorneys and this data management and ownership piece is especially new territory for them. There is a need to receive new information that highlights the issue so research managers understand when to engage their IP council.
- Emily asked whether the webinar Jason and Enid presented on this topic could be revised focusing on the horror stories to ensure participants are aware of the possible challenges.
- Matt Miller found research that pertains to data governance and management practices, where some states have established data governance boards- but little crossover to the IP topic was found in this research (<https://www.nap.edu/download/24777>) and legal brief on IP and digital design rights (<http://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/168710.aspx>)
- Jen Harper advised that Universities receive less funding from states these days, and there is more pressure to patent research findings. State DOTs could start getting pressure in that direction too.
- Dave floated the idea of conducting state-centric workshops to inquire about specific circumstances, cover the importance of the topic, and talk it through with design folks, and public relations departments.
- The group was very interested in IP and data management/governance as a topic. There may be value in emphasizing State DOTs use the 20-44 workshop, and ask if they'd consider using information gathered to inform IP issues to management and legal council on IP information.
- The action item from this discussion is:
 - Review NCHRP 799 and subsequent workshop documentation and discuss in the next PMQ meeting for what to do on follow up to IP as a topic.
- Jason Bittner advised that Enid would say things change so fast with software. When we were conducting the workshop, Illinois DOT talked software procurement and its impact on IP. That whole sub-topic has developed quickly into newer directions especially within the context of COVID and the transportation research community and partners doing more remote sharing. Core queries are where is your data in the cloud and how is it managed and archived? This topic has moved so fast in the five year window since NCHRP 799 that some of the findings are not even relevant right now.
- The group agreed to leave the topic on the list as a monitoring activity

5. Open Discussion

- a. No further discussion.

6. Adjournment